



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Where's Cræsus with his heaps of shining gold,
 Cadmus the first Bæotian King of old,
 Cyrus, accustomed to fierce wars' alarms,
 And mighty Xerxes with the world in arms?

Where now is Herod base or Nimrod vain,
 Or Pharaoh, drowned in the Erythræan main?
 Where Nero, tyrant of the Roman state,
 Or fell Antiochus, the reprobate?

Where's Bajazet with all his boast and might?
 Where's Tamerlane who conquered him in fight?
 Where's Arthur, who doth in our annals shine,
 Or Charlemagne with all his sceptered line?

Where's Venus, Pallas, or the wife of Jove,
 The three fair candidates of Ida's grove?
 Where the gay nymphs of the Hesperian Plain?
 Where chaste Diana and her virgin train?

The sweet-tongued Ovid for his wit expelled,
 Or Virgil who in tuneful verse excelled,
 Horace, who human errors could describe,
 Or Homer, prince of all the epic tribe?

Our Irish chiefs to whom each power gave way,
 Lughaidh Mac Con, who loved superior sway,
 Lughaidh Lagha, who stretched Arthur on the plain,
 And brave Curaio Mór, treacherously slain;

Conall the grand, who fame in battle won,
 Cuchullain, or his more intrepid son;
 Naisi, who with Deirdre sought a distant land,
 Mac Lughaidh or Osgar of the Fenian band?

Where are these kings, or men of high renown,
 These lords, these earls, and great ones of the gown,
 That they do not return and let us know
 The secret systems of the shades below?

Are they there honoured, feasted and caressed,
 In ermine robes and shining tissue dressed,
 Sparkling in all the pageantry of pride
 They here on earth enjoyed before they died?

To the above may be added a passage in *Die Jobsiade*, By Dr. Karl Arnold Kortum (part i, chap. 37), Münster, 1784, 2d ed. Dortmund, 1799, reprinted by Bobertag in *Deutsche National-Litteratur*, vol. 140, Berlin, 1883. Charles T. Brooks, in his translation of *Die Jobsiade*, Philadelphia, 1863, pp. 180 f., also quotes a passage from "Father Mulvaney's Sermon," in Mrs. Hall's *Lights and Shadows of Irish Life*, which was published in 1838, and the parts of which originally appeared in *The New Monthly Magazine*.

CLARK S. NORTHUP.

Cornell University.

How a Man May Choose a Good Wife from a Bad, edited by A. E. H. SWAEN (*Materialien zur Kunde des älteren Englischen Dramas*, xxxv). Louvain: A. Uystpruyst, 1912.

Beyond a doubt, Professor Wilhelm Bang, in issuing his admirable series of *Materialien*, is doing much to facilitate the study of the Tudor-Stuart drama. The series contains not only accurate reprints of rare and often otherwise inaccessible plays, but also such invaluable works as the facsimile of the first folio of Ben Jonson, Crawford's *Concordance to the Works of Thomas Kyd*, Feuillerat's *Documents Relating to the Office of the Revels*, and Mrs. Stopes's *William Hunnis and the Revels of the Chapel Royal*. Moreover, the series is vigorous, and is sturdily marching forward, with many new volumes promised for the immediate future. From among these may be singled out for particular notice the Loseley mss., and the concordances to Marlowe and to Jonson.

The latest volume of the series, *How a Man May Choose a Good Wife from a Bad*, will be heartily welcome to students of the early drama. Professor A. E. H. Swaen, of the University of Groningen, has reproduced the play from the first quarto, and has furnished the volume with a scholarly introduction and a mass of erudite notes. The play fully deserves this honor, for it is one of the best of the anonymous dramas of Elizabeth's reign. Its steady popularity in the first half of the seventeenth century is attested by editions in 1602, 1605, 1608, 1614, 1621, 1630, and 1634. In modern times it has been reprinted by Baldwin in his *Old English Drama*, 1824-5, and by Hazlitt in his issue of Dodsley's *Old English Plays*, 1874; but in these editions the text is far from satisfactory, and the critical apparatus negligible. Simultaneously with Professor Swaen's reprint has appeared a photographic reproduction of the play (indeed of the same copy, British Museum C. 34, b. 53) by Mr. John S. Farmer in *The Tudor Facsimile Texts*. The latter, of course, is devoid

of introduction or notes; it serves, however, as a ready means to test the accuracy of Professor Swaen's reprint.

For such a test I have very carefully collated five pages of the reprint with the facsimile, selecting the pages at random. I have found the reprint to vary in no jot or tittle from the original, except on page 83, where the catchword, *Seeke*, should not be followed by a period; and in this case Professor Swaen was misled by a small ink blotch on the paper.

In discussing the bibliography of the early editions, Professor Swaen overlooks Mr. Greg's *List of Plays*, and instead takes as the basis of his discussion Hazlitt's *Manual for the Collector and Amateur of Old English Plays*. This oversight is unfortunate. Thus Professor Swaen might have added to his discussion of the quarto of 1608, the existence of which Hazlitt doubted, the fact that Greg describes a genuine copy of that edition in the Bodleian Library. Regarding the second quarto of 1605, Professor Swaen says: "The copy in the British Museum Library catalogued with date of publication as 1605, is a defective one, the title and leaves up to B being wanting. . . . I have not succeeded in finding a copy bearing 1605 on the title-page, but have no doubt that Hazlitt had seen one; in that case the fragment in the British Museum may belong to that edition." Yet Professor Swaen is apparently not convinced of the existence of this edition, and subsequently refers to it with a query ("1605?"). Mr. Greg, however, describes such an edition in the Bodleian Library, and assigns the imperfect British Museum copy to that edition. The Librarian of the Bodleian informs me that "the date 1605 is given plainly on the title-page."

For his text Professor Swaen has reproduced the British Museum copy of the first quarto, 1602; and in his notes, he has recorded the significant variants in a copy of the third quarto, 1608, preserved in the Royal Library at The Hague. In two places the British Museum copy is slightly defective: "The two passages that cannot be read distinctly in the British Museum copy I have

printed from the B [*i.e.*, 1608] text." Now it is true that the defective passages are short, and the missing words and letters few; it is also true that the edition of 1608 almost undoubtedly gives the correct reading for these passages; yet we cannot help wondering why the Bodleian copy of the 1602 quarto was not consulted to supply the defective text; and still more, why the Bodleian copy was not collated with the British Museum copy for possible variant readings, especially since the text of the play is unusually corrupt. Professor Swaen, furthermore, has not indicated what relations exist between the quartos of 1602 and 1608 and the other quartos printed before the closing of the theatres. It still remains, therefore, for some one to collate two or more copies of the first edition, to collate the first and the second editions, and to point out the relations between the other early quartos.

In dealing with the interesting question of authorship, Professor Swaen rejects the attribution of the play to Joshua Cooke. This attribution, which was made in a manuscript entry on the title-page of the British Museum copy, formerly in the possession of Garrick, is not supported by the slightest evidence. Joshua Cooke is otherwise unheard of, unless he is to be identified with John Cooke, the author of *Green's Tu Quoque*. But, as Professor Swaen remarks: "There is [*in H. M. C.*] absolutely no similarity or point of agreement with John Cooke's *Green's Tu Quoque*."

In discussing the authorship, Professor Swaen does not observe, and no one, I believe, has noted the fact, that the play was attributed by William Winstanley, in *The Lives of the Most Famous English Poets*, 1687, p. 151, to Gervase Markham and William Sampson. This attribution, however, like many statements by Winstanley, is preposterous.¹ Sampson did not begin to write until 1624, and when

¹ Professor Martin Wright Sampson furnishes me with the following note: "Winstanley gets this from Edward Phillips's *Theatrum Poetarum* (1675), p. 194, where this play is attributed to Sampson and Marsham [*sic*]. To this attribution, Isaac Reed, the former owner of my copy, makes the marginal gloss, 'No.' Phillips calls the play a Tragi-Comedy."

How a Man May Choose was staged, he was only eleven years of age; nor does the play bear the slightest resemblance to the known works of Gervase Markham.

After rejecting the untrustworthy attribution of the play to Joshua Cooke, Professor Swaen attempts to prove that no less an author than Thomas Heywood is responsible for its composition. With this conclusion every careful student of Heywood will, I think, agree. In a recent number of *Englische Studien* (xlv. 30-44), I tried to put the attribution of the play to Heywood on a firm foundation by citing numerous passages which find a more or less exact parallel in thought and in phraseology to passages in the undoubted works of Heywood. Since that paper was written, some two years ago, I have discovered not a few similar striking parallelisms. But more proof than is afforded by that article and by Professor Swaen's introduction is not needed, I believe, to establish beyond a doubt Heywood's authorship of this admirable drama.

In discussing the source of the play, the editor says: "According to Langbain, Hazlitt, and Fleay, the incident of Anselme saving young Arthur's wife by taking her out of the grave, and carrying her to his mother's house is related in the 'Ninth Novel of *The Pleasant Companion* (printed in 8vo in London, 1684) stil'd, *Love in the Grave*' (Langbain, *The Lives and Characters of the English Dramatick Poets*, p. 161). No such book is known to the authorities of the British Museum." This is a rather summary treatment of Langbaine. If, indeed, the book is not known to the authorities of the British Museum, it is known to other bibliographers. A detailed description of the work may be found in Hazlitt's *Bibliographical Collections and Notes* (Third Series, 1887), p. 258. Probably the story in *The Pleasant Companion* was based on Cinthio's *Hecatomithi* iii. v; the title-page describes the work as "Being a choice Collection of most excellent Stories, gathered from the Latin, French, Italian and Spanish Authors." However that may be, there can be little doubt that the play was based on Cinthio's novel—probably on Riche's transla-

tion of it in his *Farewell to Military Profession*, 1581, which Professor Swaen reprints in full.

The influence of Shakespeare's *Much Ado About Nothing* upon this play, though unnoted by scholars, seems to me to be obvious. Old Master Lusam, who attends at the elbow, and echoes, Old Master Arthur, seems to have been suggested by Verges. The description that Dogberry makes of the latter is quite applicable to Old Lusam: "Goodman Verges, sir, speaks a little off the matter: an old man, sir, and his wits are not so blunt as, God help, I would desire they were; but, in faith, honest as the skin between his brows." And old Master Arthur, at least in his relation to Old Master Lusam, resembles Dogberry. But Dogberry is honored by a much closer imitation in the self-important and verbose Justice Reason. Note, for example, the following (ll. 872-91):

Iust. Nay, stay, my friend, we must examine you.
What can you say concerning this debate
Betwixt young M. Arthur and his wife?

Young Lu. Faith, just as much, I think, as you
can say,
And that's just nothing.

Iust. How, nothing? Come, depose him, take his
oath,
Swear him, I say; take his confession.

Old Ar. What can you say, sir, in this doubtful
case?

Young Lu. Why nothing, sir.

Iust. We cannot take him in contrary tales,
For he says nothing still, and that same nothing
Is that which we have stood on all this while.
He hath confest even all, for all is nothing.
Since nothing, then, so plainly is confest,
And we by cunning answers and by wit
Have wrought him to confess nothing to us,
Write his confession.

Old Ar. Why, what should we write?

Iust. Why, nothing: heard you not as well as I
What he confest? I say write nothing down.

Much Ado was composed in 1599, and was doubtless very popular on the stage in 1600-1601, when *How a Man May Choose* was written.

The Notes supplied by Professor Swaen are numerous and scholarly. I record below the additions and corrections which my reading of the play has suggested.

Title-page. It seems highly unfortunate to have set up *in type* as a part of the regular title-page the untrustworthy manuscript note "written by Ioshua Cooke," which was entered by some unknown person in ink on the title-page of the Garrick copy. At least brackets should have been used to indicate that the line was a manuscript insertion.

L. 4. "*The Exchange.* The *New Exchange* in the Strand, built in 1609, is meant." But the play was printed in 1602, and was written, probably, in 1601 or earlier. Of course the old, or Royal, Exchange built by Sir Thomas Gresham is referred to.

L. 89, 90. "The second quarto has *shrew*." And so frequently throughout the notes the edition of 1608 is referred to as "the second quarto." But in reality this is the third quarto.

L. 109. Professor Swaen's quotation from Ovid reproduces the modern text; it seems worth noting that the Elizabethan version is correctly quoted in the play, *i.e.*, "*medicabilis*" instead of "*sanabilis*." Cf. the same quotation in Middleton's *The Family of Love*, iii. v; in Jones's *Adrasta*, sig. C; in Sir Gyles Goosecap, l. 2270; and in *The Wit of a Woman*, sig. D, verso.

L. 162. "*So that indeed my belly wambled.* Wamble, to be disturbed with nausea." But in this sentence the word is obviously used in its equally common meaning "to rumble" (a meaning which Professor Swaen also records). Without this meaning, the obscene jest of l. 164 is lost.

L. 544. "In *The Captives* . . . ascribed to Heywood." Here and elsewhere Professor Swaen regards the attribution of *The Captives* to Heywood as very doubtful. In his Introduction, p. viii, he says: "If *The Captives*; or *The Lost Recovered* is by Heywood, as its editor, A. H. Bullen, thinks"; and in a foot-note he gives some evidence from the peculiar use of certain words to show that Heywood was the author of the play. But the attribution of the play to Heywood does not rest upon the opinion of Mr. Bullen; we have on this point the authority of no less a person than Herbert, the Master of the Revels,

recorded at the time that he licensed the play for performance.

Ll. 633-4:

1. *Boy.* Forsooth my lessons torne out of my booke.

Amin. *Que caceris chartis deseruisse decet.*

Professor Swaen says: "The meaning of 634 is not quite clear; perhaps *caceris* stands for *laceris*. The sense would then be: which you should have left in your torn books." Beyond a doubt *caceris* is connected with the Latin verb *caco*. The line seems to have been suggested by Catullus 36. 1: *cacata charta*. Possibly *caceris* is a corruption of the contracted form of the perfect subjunctive *cacaris*; or it may be a use of the present passive subjunctive for the active. The jest is too coarse for translation.

L. 647. "*Qui mihi*, no doubt the beginning of a sentence in the grammar." To be specific, this is the beginning of a long poem placed at the end of William Lilly's *Latin Grammar*. The title of the poem is *Carmen Gvillelmi Lilli ad discipulos, de moribus*.

Ll. 668-672. Since the text of the play is in many places corrupt, we may be justified in slightly emending these lines to read as follows:

Pip. *Queso preceptor, queso?* for God's sake do not whip my *Quid est gramatica*.

Ami. Not whip your *Quid est gramatica?* What's that?

Pip. *Gramatica est* that if I untrussed, you must needs whip me upon, the *quid est gramatica*.

Compare this with the following passage in Heywood's *Wise Woman of Hogsden* (ed. 1873, v. 323):

Sen. Sir Boniface, *quid est grammatica?*

Sir Bon. *Grammatica est ars.*

Sir Harry. Fye, fye, no more of these words, good Sir Boniface.

Ll. 704-5. The schoolmaster says to his pupils:

He that minds trish trash, & will not have care of his *rodix*

He l wil be lish lash, and haue a fling at his *podix*.

Professor Swaen rightly alters *podix* to *podex*; but he has difficulty with the word *rodix*, or *rodex*: "I suppose *rodix* is meant for a playful latinization of *road* in connection with the preceding *vbi fuistis*." Since the error of *c* for *r* is one of the commonest of Elizabethan misprints, I suggest that for *rodex* we read *codex*, i.e., books, lessons.

L. 1004. "It is difficult to see whether the *e* of *thankes* is broken, or whether it is 'thank's.'" Professor Swaen prints the word as *thank's*; but Farmer's Photographic Facsimile shows very clearly that the word is *thankes*.

L. 1066. "That bare Anatomy, that Iack a Lent." Professor Swaen calls attention to the somewhat unusual use of the phrase Jack a Lent. Cf. Heywood's *The Foure Prentises* (ed. 1874, II. 186): "You olde Anatomy . . . you old Iack a lent."

L. 1071. *That Stockfish, that poore Iohn, that gut of men*. "No doubt Brabo thinks of the dried guts used for violin strings." May not *gut* be here used as a term of opprobrium? The sense would be "that gut of humanity."

L. 1076. "grim Malkin. No doubt an attempt at etymologizing! B has the same spelling." The meaning of this note is not clear. *Grim-malkin* was a very common spelling of the word; cf. Baldwin's *Beware the Cat*, 1561-82; and for other examples see the *N. E. D.* under "Grimalkin." It would be more correct to say that Aminadab selected this spelling of the word for the sake of the pun.

Ll. 1292-5. "Something is wrong here." I suggest that for *being* in l. 1293 we read *buying*.

Ll. 1360-1:

Pater & mater, father and mother
Frater & soror, sister and brother.

Not only for the translation, but also for the metre, we should read "Soror & frater." The lines, perhaps, should be printed thus:

Pater et mater
Father and mother
Soror et frater
Sister and brother.

L. 1367. "Both A and B have 'I have I got thee.' The metre is correct. Perhaps we should read: I (ay), I have got thee." The original reading seems to me much the better. "Ay, have I got thee?" is addressed joyfully to the vial of poison which Arthur has just snatched from the hand of Aminadab; cf. l. 1409: "O I am glad I haue thee."

L. 1518. "*Pip*. M. Hue, as welcom as heart can tel, or tong can think." Possibly an echo of Bottom's speech: "The eye of man hath not heard, the ear of man hath not seen, man's hand is not able to taste, his tongue to conceive, nor his heart to report, what my dream was."—*M. N. D.* IV. i. Heywood often shows the influence of Shakespeare.

L. 1578. Young Arthur, the host, says to his guests, who are ready to seat themselves at the banquet: "Gentles, put ore your legges." Professor Swaen comments: "evidently 'cross your legs, sit down.' I am unable to furnish other examples." I have heard the phrase used in country houses where the guests at meals sat on benches. Expanded, the phrase would be: "Gentles, put your legs over the bench."

L. 1625. Clearly this line is spoken by Pipkin, not by Aminadab.

L. 1639. *The Parson of Pancridge*. A common name, apparently, for the "convenient parson" of Tudor-Stuart days. See Middleton's *The Fair Quarrel*, ed. Bullen, IV. 272; *A Woman is a Weathercock*, ed. Haz.-Dods., XI. 33; and the Vicar of Pancridge in Jonson's *Tale of a Tub*.

L. 1788 *wy loue*: a misprint for *my loue*. Cf. Farmer's facsimile.

Ll. 1956-7:

*Mean time vnloose your sachel & your bookes,
Draw, draw, and take you to your lessons boyes.*

"I fail to see the meaning of *draw*, thus used absolutely." Possibly the schoolmaster meant "Draw your books from your satchels." He may have had vaguely in mind the use of the word as applied to the sword.

L. 2050. "*We will be married in a lawless Church*. *N. E. D.* gives no light." Probably the reference is to such a church as that pre-

sided over by the Parson of Pancridge, or the Parson of Fanchurch.

L. 2096. *Tis salfe*: a misprint for *Tis false*. See Farmer's facsimile.

Ll. 2320-1:

To attach the murderer, he once hangd and dead,
His wealth is mine: pursue the slave thats dead.

Apparently the word *dead* at the end of the second line was caught by the typesetter from the line above. I suggest that we substitute for it the word *fled*.

L. 2547, *on my knee I begges*; so the original, but read *on my knees I begge*.

Ll. 2609-12:

Hei mihi, what shuld I say, the poison giuē I denay:
He took it perforce frō my hands, and *domine* why
not I

Got it of a gentleman, he most freely gaue it,
Aske he knew me, a means was only to haue it.

This passage seems hopelessly corrupt; ll. 2610 and 2612 seem to have been pied. The meaning of Aminadab's speech, however, is clear from other passages in the play. I have attempted to reconstruct the verse as follows:

Hei mihi what should I say,
The poison given I denay,
He took it perforce from my hand,
And *domine* why I not understand.
I got it of a gentleman,
He most freely gave it
As he knew my meaning was
Only rats to have it.

The change of *hands* to *hand* has some sanction from l. 2614, in which Young Arthur, in corroborating the statement of the schoolmaster, uses in a certain measure the same language: "Tis true, I tooke it from this man perforce, And snatcht it from his hand." The author's mind would naturally repeat the singular form. The construction "I not understand" is common with Heywood. In the last line, the addition of the word *rats* is suggested by ll. 1305-1315, and ll. 2627-8.

L. 2737. *Here lues perpetuall ioy, nere burning woe*. So in the original editions; but for *nere* read *here*.

Students of Heywood, as well as students of the Tudor-Stuart drama in general, will be grateful to Professor Swaen for placing within their reach so accurate a reprint of this fine old play, furnished with so valuable an introduction and body of notes.

JOSEPH QUINCY ADAMS, JR.

Cornell University.

RECENT FRENCH GRAMMARS

A New French Grammar based on the recommendations of the Joint Committee on Grammatical Terminology, by E. A. SONNENSCHN. Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1912. 211 pp.

Fundamentals of French Grammar with illustrative texts, exercises, and vocabularies, by WILLIAM B. SNOW. New York, Holt, 1912. xi + 267 pp.

Essentials of French, by VICTOR E. FRANÇOIS. New York, American Book Company, 1912. 426 pp.

It is the feeling of many teachers that the really satisfactory French grammar has not yet been written. Perhaps this accounts for the appearance almost simultaneously of three new grammars. The first comes to us from England, and we wish to say at the outset that in many ways it is excellent. Mr. Sonnenschein evidently knows his French thoroughly and, what is more, has the qualities of logic and orderliness, so that he notes for us clearly, and often with real psychological felicity, not only the most important traits, but also the minor peculiarities of French accidence and syntax. It would be pleasant to comment at length upon the results of these qualities; but there is another thing in his book which has a prior right to our attention, since it is of vital importance not merely to the success of this particular grammar but of all French grammars to be written in future. Mr. Sonnenschein was the chairman of an English committee appointed to consider "the